THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 12. MARCH, 1942. Vol. XXXI.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Archbishop William Temple.

The nomination of Dr. William Temple to be Archbishop of Canterbury will come as no surprise. Although there are a number of our diocesan bishops who might well have proved themselves to be good primates, it must be acknowledged that in many ways Dr. Temple is more richly endowed than any member of our present episcopate. He is a good scholar and possessed of outstanding philosophical powers. He, with Dr. Barnes and Dr. Henson, are our only three living bishops who have delivered the Gifford Lectures. As a writer on theological, educational, political and social subjects, he has at least twenty volumes to his credit. Of these, *Mens Creatrix*, *Christus Veritas*, and *Nature, Man, and God* have proved of great help to many educated readers who desire to profess a reasonable Christian faith. Philosophically he is a Christian Realist, optimistic and positive—*totus teres, atque rotundus*. As a pulpit and platform orator, he possesses quite exceptional gifts of eloquence. He is most popular with young men and women, especially those of the student class. His great gift of humour and his easy and simple manners add to his powers of attraction. Above all, he is what our American friends would call 'a great executive' possessed of remarkable organizing and administrative ability, uniting a happy combination of drive and tact. Under the pseudonym of 'Og' our Primate-elect was thus depicted some

thirty years ago by Mgr. Ronald Knox in his amusing satire *Absolute and Abitofhell*:

> 'First from the Public Schools—*Lernaean Bog*—
> No paltry Bulwark, stood the Form of Og.
> A man so broad, to some he seemed to be
> Not one, but all Mankind in Effigy:
> Who, brisk in Term, a Whirlwind in the Long,
> Did everything by turns, and nothing wrong,
> Bill'd at each Lecture-hall from Thames to Tyne
> As Thinker, Usher, Statesman, or Divine.
> Born in the Purple, swift he chose the Light,
> And Lambeth mark'd him for a Nazirite.'

Only on political grounds might some who favoured him personally and recognized his great qualities object to his election. At the present time, objections on political grounds should matter little since we happily possess a Government which includes all political parties. Furthermore, those who desire the promotion of Christian influence in this country must recognize the importance of having a Primate who commands the confidence of those Labour circles where organized Christianity has least influence and where the Church of England is ignored as an effete anachronism. Those Churchmen whose social and economic policy is that of the late Lord Stamp rather than that of the Malvern Conference will feel no alarm politically at the elevation of Dr. Temple, whose Socialist sympathies have been prompted, not by the attractions of class warfare and the stern resolution to liquidate all political and economic opponents, but by the desire to advance popular education and secure social amelioration.

Educated at Rugby and Balliol, the future Primate of All England has always been a strong political Liberal. Yet he is probably to-day (notwithstanding the movement of Liberalism towards the left) much more in the line of the Asquithian tradition than he is a supporter of Mr. Maxton's particular brand of Labour politics. His generosity and kindness of heart have endeared him to many who share neither his political nor his ecclesiastical outlook.

Yet, if it be difficult to tell where precisely Dr. Temple stands politically, it is even more difficult to tell where he stands ecclesiastically. It is impossible for those who recall his essay on 'The Divinity of Christ,' contributed to *Foundations* (published in 1912) under the leadership of the late B. H. Streeter,

to believe that he can be *au fond* anything else than a theological and ecclesiastical liberal, or to suppose that he is not in the apostolic succession of his father, Archbishop Frederick Temple, who, as Headmaster of Rugby, contributed the first essay to *Essays and Reviews*, which inaugurated nationally the great liberal Church movement of the nineteenth century, and caused in conservative Church circles a storm of protest and indignation such as no subsequent liberal pronouncement has roused.

Our new Primate's early loyalty to his father's liberal theological outlook is demonstrated by his citing in *Foundations* two of his father's most remarkable theological predictions — both indeed well known, but deserving of constant repetition until their fulfilment be accomplished :

> 'I cannot help thinking that *a* dogmatic theology is yet to be looked for which will avoid both the difficulties (putrefaction and petrification). I cannot help thinking that much of that will consist in distinct refusals to define — a dogmatism hitherto never practised by the Church.' (1850.)
>
> 'Our theology has been cast in a scholastic mould, *i.e.* all based on Logic. We are in need of and we are being gradually forced into a theology based on psychology. The transition, I fear, will not be without much pain ; but nothing can prevent it.' (1857.)

Yet to be frank, we have to confess that the Archbishop-elect has on several occasions in recent years — we do not propose to name these occasions — exhibited reactionary tendencies which have delighted the most bitter opponents of ecclesiastical and theological liberalism. However, we cannot bring ourselves to believe that these reactionary manifestations really express the fundamental convictions and sympathies of William Temple, the man : rather they are the appropriate ecclesiastical gestures expected from William Temple, the prelate. If this dichotomy persists or develops, we can foresee a very real danger to what the Archbishop can accomplish on behalf of English Christianity in this critical period of our Church's existence. We venture to hope that when, as Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Temple is faced with difficult and dangerous decisions, it will be William Temple, the man, and not William Temple, the Archbishop, who will pronounce the decision.

Dr. Temple is credited with having said that the bishops are the organs of the Holy Ghost or they are nothing. This statement is indeed true, not only of every bishop, but of every

Christian man and woman; but only those can become organs of the Divine Spirit who yield all their personal powers to him *in unfettered freedom.* If, in the case of our new Primate, the man subsumes the Archbishop and not the Archbishop the man, we may hope for a period of Church life in which the promise and potency of the *Ecclesia Gentis Anglorum*, at home and beyond the seas, will exhibit its true character as an unrivalled unifying, uplifting, developing and expanding power in our national life, such as has never been equalled in any preceding period of what the late Augustine Birrell called 'the troublesome history of the Church of England.'

Dr. Temple's Penguin.

Some Penguins proclaim their message to mankind in the *première jeunesse* of their authors. Their effect, like the cock's shrill clarion at dawn, is to awake us from somnolence. They are the utterance of imagination and prophetic vision. Other Penguins, as Hegel said of Minerva's owl, only wing their flight when the shades of night are falling. They present, in popular form, the ripe wisdom of the *magnum opus* of their author.

Dr. Temple's Penguin,* *Christianity and Social Order*, is of the latter kind. Its author has been a student of Christianity and social order from his youth up. He has written and spoken much on many aspects of both themes. In his Penguin (just published) he deals with the claim of Christianity to influence and direct the evolution of our social order.

No Christian Englishman to-day will seriously challenge the duty of Christianity to influence the social order. The Christian Religion has done this from the earliest days of our era down to the present time. Where a difference occurs in Christian circles is *how* this Christian influence is to be exerted. Is it to be done simply—and this is no small and easy task—by making human beings Christian in their principles and ideals, conduct and character, and so inspiring them with love to God and man that they are bound to exercise an influence on human society which leads that society to become more just and wise, more beneficent and less selfish, more divine and less brutish,

* *Christianity and Social Order*, by William Temple, Archbishop of York. Published by Penguin Books Ltd., Hammondsworth, Middlesex, 1942. Price 6*d*.

more united and less quarrelsome, more happy and less miserable, and so more in accordance with the mind of Christ than would otherwise be the case? In other words, is the Christian Religion to act *indirectly* by way of influence in the amelioration of our social, economic and political conditions, or is it to act *directly* and in *organized manner through the corporate action of the Christian Church* in its efforts to effect certain *specific reforms* in our economic, political and social order?

Dr. Temple is convinced that the Christian Religion must act in both ways. Those who stand with him can claim the support of mediaeval ecclesiastical Scholasticism, Calvinistic Protestantism and the teaching of our great Christian Socialists —Ludlow, F. D. Maurice, Charles Kingsley, John Ruskin and a host of others. This second attitude Dr. Temple describes in popular phraseology as the right of the Church to '*interfere* in politics.' Those who stand for the indirect personal influence method alone have the New Testament, Primitive Christianity and the leaders of English Evangelicalism and Methodism on their side. Strong arguments and outstanding precedents can be used by both sides to justify their respective policies.

Dr. Temple, in accordance with his *technique*, suggested perhaps by Jacob or Ulysses, divides his volume into two parts, so that if hostile attack should assail one part, at least the other part may hope to escape disaster. Thus, halving the risks of rejection and doubling the chances of acceptance, he offers first the more attractive portion of his treatise.

What Dr. Temple writes in his treatise proper will appear reasonable enough to most modern Christian Englishmen. In it he renounces Communism : he seeks a *tertium quid* between collectivism and individualism : he admits self-interest as an economic factor : he finds nothing wrong with business profits and interest on capital as such : he recognizes the responsibility, not of the employer but of the State, to supplement wages by family allowances : he holds that it is incumbent on the State to abolish the terrible evil of unemployment by providing paid work for all the unemployed : he stands for the development of all those central services by which the victims of sickness, accidents, old-age, poverty, are humanely relieved by the State : he approves the policy, already far advanced, of providing better housing for our labouring classes : he insists on the need for

improving and extending our educational system: he pleads for investigating methods of relieving employees as far as possible from the monotony and humiliation of purely mechanistic toil, and urges the reduction of working hours by which the workman shall secure leisure for really recreative recreation, adult education and fuller enjoyment of family life and social intercourse: in this connection he desires that the week should consist of five working days and that summer holidays with full pay should be the right of every employee.

There can be few of our fellow-citizens, Christian or non-Christian, who do not support this programme of social reform. Some will doubt whether the financial situation after the war will permit of this programme being realized in all its fulness: others will lay stress on the need for so realizing it as not to weaken the energy, the initiative and sense of responsibility which ought to be developed in the individual citizen, not only in his own personal interest but also in the interest of the efficiency of the State. But, taken as a whole, this programme will receive, and indeed has in a large measure already received, general support in the country from all classes and parties.

The second part of Dr. Temple's Penguin, entitled 'Appendix' (less than a fourth of the length of the first part), will seem to some 'though small in size, great in depravity' (the verdict of a mediaeval Pope on a *libellus* which annoyed him much). Here we see the Primate-elect, although he disclaims being a communist, slithering down the slippery slope to Collectivism. It is true that he never demands communal ownership, yet he favours policies by which ultimately all large-scale industries and natural resources, including the land, will be owned communally. When in economics and politics God's ownership of the land and the King's ownership of the land are stressed, we may be quite sure that it is preliminary to the individual citizen being deprived of his ownership of the land.

As Dr. Temple makes no claim that the views expressed in his 'Appendix' demand the support of Christians, we do not propose to deal with the 'Appendix' here beyond drawing attention to one golden sentence in it:

> 'The art of government is not to devise what would be the best system for saints to work, but to secure that the lower motives actually found among men prompt that conduct which the higher motives demand' (p. 76).

Dr. Temple's Penguin presents a powerful case for the exercise of Christian *influence* in the economic, political and social spheres, but we think that it fails to prove either the need or the duty of the Church to interfere directly in politics. Ecclesiastical action of this kind, although well intended and in certain cases beneficial, has a direful and detrimental record against it, and tends in the long run to sin against Christian freedom and Christian love and to produce a most tyrannical type of ecclesiastical totalitarianism terminated by an anti-Christian revolution.

In concluding our notes on this most significant volume by the Primate-elect, we venture to draw attention to what seem to us to be three weaknesses in his main thesis.

(1) *Dr. Temple's demand that those employed in a business must have the right to control it.* After surveying our present economic system Dr. Temple remarks, with robust good sense:

> 'The existing system has many triumphs to its credit; it has raised the standard of life for the common people to a level never reached before. The life of the "working people" is for the most part neither impoverished, nor over-burdensome, or lacking in interest.'

He then proceeds as follows:

> 'But it suffers from one great lack, from one common evil, and from one terrible menace. The great lack is the absence of any voice in the control or direction of the concern to which most of the waking hours of the day are given. Till this can be remedied there will be one most important respect in which the working class is shut out from a vitally important expression of personality. Men have fought and died for a voice in making the laws which they are to obey; that is the essence of political liberty. But the government of the firm for which he works affects a man's life more closely than the government of his State; yet in it he has no part except so far as he may threaten to hold up the process by withdrawing his labour and that of his fellow-workers in a strike. In many businesses nowadays the workers are often consulted, especially about regulations affecting hours and conditions of work. So far, so good; but this is done as of favour and not as a matter of secured right. The cause of freedom will not be established till political freedom is fulfilled in economic freedom' (pp. 70-71).

This seems to us a doctrinaire and dangerous statement. Clarity demands further definition. In any great business there is, first, the procuring the necessary capital and providing for an adequate supply of raw material; secondly, the industrial process by which the raw material is converted into marketable goods; thirdly, the securing and maintenance of a market. Does Dr.

Temple mean that those who are employed in the second stage should possess control of what is done in the first and third stages? That would be absurd, since the workers in the second stage have no first-hand knowledge of what is being done in the first and third stages. Presumably what must be intended is departmental control of the concern by the workers in their own departments. This would inevitably create conflict between departments and, by creating disunion, weaken the business and reduce its prospects of success.

All that can be granted to the workers is the right to be heard officially, regularly and sympathetically in all matters concerning the welfare, convenience and efficiency of the workers in their own department. It seems to us that no reasonable employee ought to demand more than the right to be consulted and to set forth his wrongs and needs freely. Control must remain in the hands of those who are responsible for the welfare of the whole concern. This was crudely expressed by a great nineteenth-century captain of industry, who said to his employees:

> 'I want to do all I can for your welfare and contentment. I invite you to share the business profits with me in a scheme which I am about to lay before you, but I cannot and will not give you any control of the business. I created this great business. Not one of you could have done it. I know how best to direct it. Control must remain in my hands.'

What is true of business is true of other spheres of human activity. Control can only be safely placed in the hands of the competent and responsible head of the concern. We should none of us feel secure as Churchmen if the Archbishop of Canterbury yielded to a demand by his typist to share his control of the government of the Church of England and the direction of the Anglican Communion—*ne sutor supra crepidam.*

(2) *Dr. Temple makes great use of the concept of 'the Natural Order' as a means of testing the rightness or wrongness of 'the existing order' in whole or in part.* This concept seems to us as difficult to define as it is to apply. Dr. Temple thus defines or describes (p. 57) it:

> 'In earlier times, Christian thinkers made great use of the notion of Natural Law. They did not mean by this a generalization from a large number of observed phenomena, which is what a modern scientist means; they meant the proper function of a human activity as apprehended by a consideration of its own nature. In practice, the Natural Order or Natural Law is discovered partly by observing the generally accepted standards of judgement and partly by consideration

> of the proper functions of whatever is the subject of enquiry. This is a task for human reason; but so far as reason enables us to reach the truth about anything in its own essence and in its relationships, it enables us to see it as it is in the mind of God. Thus it is a Natural, not a Supernatural, Order with which we are concerned; but as God is the Creator, this Natural Order is His order and its law His law.'

This test of what is right in the economic, political and social spheres is so complicated that it is bound to create confusion of thought and to promote sophistry in its application. The modern world, increasingly dominated by scientific thought, understands by the term 'the Natural Order' something quite different from what Catholic writers on sociology and economics mean by the term. It seems a pity, therefore, in the interests of mutual understanding between the world and the Church that Dr. Temple should use this scholastic terminology. For example, as a test of what is to determine the right relations between producer and consumer in the economic world, he concludes as the result of this test of 'the Natural Order' that

> 'the consumer ought not to come in only or chiefly as a means to the interest of the producer; his interest ought to be paramount. For in the Natural Order consumption is the end of production' (p. 73).

We should like to see how this test of 'the Natural Order' would work out if applied to the axiom of the Tichborne Claimant:

> 'Surely them as has money and no brains is made for them as has brains and no money.'

If the complicated character of this concept confuses issues for the scientist, it smacks of sophistry for the plain Christian. From the Christian point of view there are much more simple and searching tests of what is sound or unsound in our social, economic and political policies and practices than can be supplied by 'the Natural Order' test — such tests, for instance, as those put forward by Lord Stamp in his *Christianity and Economics**: (i) the ideal of brotherhood; (ii) the principle of stewardship; (iii) the doctrine of the good neighbour; (iv) the equality of value of each individual soul.

(3) *Insufficient stress on moral failure of individuals as a powerful source of economic and social evils.* We should have expected *a priori* that a great Christian leader, dealing in a popular treatise with *Christianity and Social Order*, would have laid much stress on the many failures of our social order which

**Christianity and Economics*, by Lord Stamp. (Macmillan & Co., 1939.)

are created and aggravated by the evil conduct and character of the individual, and on the consequent *urgent need* for moral reformation. This note is hardly sounded at all.

It is too easily assumed that economic conditions are the main causes of our social ills. On the contrary, individual moral failure is a very serious cause of these ills. Parents by their own lack of self-discipline and by failure to train their children in right ways are responsible for much social evil. Not parental viciousness, but sheer weakness, indolence and folly are the causes of this state of things. We venture on an illustration from our limited experience.

It seems to be assumed that malnutrition is *invariably* due to parental poverty and can be relieved by providing free meals for the children. The experience of the present writer is narrow but it touches reality. The officially reported cases of malnutrition of children within the writer's experience were on investigation found to be due, not to parental poverty, but (1) to the absence of parental discipline and good sense which would have compelled the children to eat regularly good, plain and wholesome food, and (2) to the incompetence and sloth of mothers who did not know how to cook or were too lazy to cook proper meals for their families. What many of us have learnt from our evacuee experience is not that our economic system is the cause of our ills in many of the most serious cases, but that there is an amazing lack of moral responsibility among large masses of our population. We have come to realize, for instance, not how bad are the housing conditions in London working-class suburbs, but how disgusting are the habits of their inhabitants. These are certainly a powerful factor in creating slums, although by no means the only factor in their creation.

What is very clear from the Christian point of view is that a survey of our social order demands some better means be used for bringing the influence of Christian Religion and Christian Morality to bear on our nation than is the case at present, and that it is particularly the duty of the Church to find out how best to do this and to carry it out effectively.

DOCTORS AND PARSONS*

By the Rev. A. W. Adams, M.A., Chaplain of the Royal Hospital and Infirmary, Sheffield.

ONE of the minor tragedies of present-day social life is that, apart from occasional contacts of a social and professional nature — for example, when they meet as fellow-guests, or when the parson baptizes the doctor's baby, or the doctor looks down the parson's sore throat — there is very little *liaison* in the day-to-day work of the medical and clerical professions. It is odd, because they are both concerned with the same object — humanity, collectively and individually. It is odder still when we remember that they are both concerned with the same aspect of humanity — its health. It may be objected that whereas one has to do with physical health, the other is concerned with the mental, moral, emotional, or (in religious language) the spiritual health of the individual or community. But increasing knowledge seems to show that it is impossible to bifurcate the two in that way, as though they existed in separate watertight compartments. The amount of superficially physical illness that is due to underlying mental and moral maladjustment is certainly great, much greater than many on the surgical side, perhaps, would be willing to admit. On the other hand, there are many instances of what, in the past, parsons would call spiritual illness which are due to some deficiency of heredity or environment or to some physical disorder — again a much higher percentage than some parsons would allow. Yet in spite of that, there is a great lack of contact and co-operation between the two professions, a kind of No-Man's-Land.

There is, of course, one obvious solution, which to some extent is being tried. 'Teach the doctor more psychology so that he can not only recognize non-physical conditions, but be

* The substance of this paper grew out of a series of discussions between doctors and clergy of different denominations meeting under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Sheffield, and was given as a lecture to the class of Final Year Students of the Sheffield Medical School at the invitation of Dr. E. Fretson Skinner, M.D., F.R.C.P., and later to the honorary and resident staff of the Sheffield Royal Hospital.

able to deal with them.' To that some medical men might be tempted to add, 'Teach the parson more psychology too, so that he can see people and their mental problems in a more scientific light, instead of reiterating out-of-date ideas about sin and so forth which no one believes in.' If would-be doctors and parsons could agree to having their training still further lengthened, a plan of that kind might have a fair degree of success, always assuming that when they have qualified, the doctors and parsons so trained would always be the right kind of people to apply their acquired psychological knowledge. But at best it would be a dangerous assumption, and it is unlikely that it would eliminate those disasters which have occurred in the past and would certainly recur in the future. For example, it frequently happens on the medical side that a pure psychologist, as a psychologist, can only take a case so far. For it does not follow that because a mental condition can be reduced to psychological terms, it can be cured by the orthodox methods of psychological therapy, at any rate when one is dealing with people whose mental background and moral standards are, rightly or wrongly, of a religious kind. If a person believes that there is such a thing as sin, and that he is answerable to God for his shortcomings, he is not likely to be put right by being told that he is suffering from a 'guilt complex.' On the other hand there is the other kind of disaster, rare perhaps, but a disaster none the less—*e.g.* when a clergyman who, having dabbled in psychotherapy, attempts to deal with a case which refuses to yield to his treatment. Only too late he sends the patient to a doctor, who diagnoses something physical—a brain-tumour, perhaps, too far advanced for any medical treatment to be of any use. It looks as though the only satisfactory solution, on these separatist lines, would be to train all doctors as parsons and all parsons as doctors. That of course would be impossible, and if possible undesirable. The only workable solution is for the doctor and parson to work together; after all, two heads are better than one.

What is the reason for this No-Man's-Land? It is all due to an accident of history, of seventeenth century history; to the fact that just at that time the science of pure mathematics was making rapid advances, and Descartes, a mathematician turned

philosopher, began to doubt. Oddly enough it was not his religious beliefs that he began to doubt, but the evidence of his senses.

To cut a long story short, what Descartes did was to drive a wedge between mind and matter. Moreover, according to him the only knowledge we can have of matter, that is, of the external world, including our bodies, is of the mathematical kind. 'I will admit in physics no principles which are not admitted in mathematics.' So modern physics and biology were set on their single-track lines of quantitive, mechanistic explanation, and the results in psychology were equally far-reaching. The problem which Descartes had set by separating entirely mind and matter was later solved, not by scrapping his system altogether, but by reducing mind to matter, making thought (so-called) a by-product of physiological, chemico-physical events. Behaviourism and psycho-physical parallelism thus have Descartes to their father.

The amazing progress of scientific knowledge, especially in the nineteenth century, seemed to justify the method, and the cleavage between science and religion became acute. Scientists suspected religious people of perpetuating outworn dogmas which had long ceased to have any meaning. Religious people suspected science as the enemy of religion. That suspicion is still common, though the reason for it has passed away in these days when eminent scientists openly declare that the rigid mechanistic explanation is inadequate for reviewing the whole field. Religion — the right sort of religion — has nothing to fear from science, nor has the right sort of science anything to fear from religion. It now seems obvious to us that if, for its special purposes of investigation, science eliminates all that cannot be measured and weighed (like considerations of goodness, beauty, value, purpose and so on), we cannot expect to find them in the result. The trouble arose when scientists, having ignored these considerations at the outset, pretended that they were not there.

The suspicion which the nineteenth century engendered between scientifically educated people and those who stand in the religious tradition still persists to some extent, for example, between the doctor, a scientifically trained person, who may be

ignorant of what religion is and stands for, and the parson who is not always conversant with the implications of science. But besides this ignorance on general issues, there is another which has to do with more practical and everyday affairs, ignorance of what the other is trying to do, his aims, methods and motives. Here I think the doctor is more likely to be at fault than the parson. That brings us back to the question of what doctors and clergy are trying to do in their respective spheres.

So far as the doctor is concerned that is easily answered. His job is to make sick people healthy and to keep them healthy. And what is meant by health? A meeting of doctors and parsons discussed just this question for a whole afternoon recently without coming to any satisfactory conclusion. One was that health means a complete adaptation to environment. But then what do you mean by environment? Is a man completely adapted to his environment if he can assimilate his food adequately, do his job efficiently, beget healthy children, and ward off such infection as comes his way? No doubt most doctors would be satisfied if they could secure that much. But what of the family and social environment and its moral problems? What of his intellectual and aesthetic environment? Perhaps it will be said that adaptation or non-adaptation here is not the doctor's job. But surely psychology shews that maladjustment in these departments leads to a good deal of mental illness, probably accompanied by physical illness as well. For example, quite a high percentage of hyperthyroidism in women is due to underlying sexual difficulties. Is the doctor then going to rest content with the usual bottle of medicine? Perhaps not. But then is he going to set up as a sociologist or educationist in a general way, and a police-court missioner cum welfare worker in dealing with individual cases, as well as practising physic and surgery in the ordinary sense of the words?

Now let us look at the parson's job. He too is concerned with health, though from a different angle. At the meeting of doctors and parsons to which I referred, it was a Roman Catholic priest who pointed out that the word salvation, with which the clergy are supposed primarily to be concerned, means, strictly speaking, the state of health. And the parson, too might quite

well accept the definition of health as being adaptation to environment, though no doubt he would modify it somewhat and say that health not only means adaptation but the ability to deal with, cope with, control the environment. Accepting this modified definition then, I would say that the parson's job, and part of the aim of religion too, is to help human beings to deal effectively with the situations and problems which they come up against in an environment which is designed to serve as a sphere of moral and intellectual and spiritual progress. If people can tackle and solve, in a way which satisfies the best side of their nature, their social, moral and intellectual problems, they will be mentally healthy and happy, and, other things being equal, physically healthy as well. If they do not, they will be not only unhappy, but they will probably be ringing the doctor's door-bell and complaining of an ache here or a pain there. But there is another side of it even from the parson's point of view. Not only can inability to cope with the wider environment affect a person's ability to deal with his physical environment but, contrariwise, a failure to deal with the physical situation can cause further failure in dealing with the mental. The psychological reaction of a man or woman to his or her physical disabilities can play havoc with their home life, their work and their outlook generally. Then a vicious circle sets in, and, because the doctor and the parson are working in isolation, the chances of its being broken are somewhat remote.

It is not necessary to say much about the vast number of cases of ordinary straight-forward sickness without any abnormal mental complications, which the doctor will attend because he will be sent for. The parson may also see the patient, though very often he will not be sent for. For some reason lay people seem to think that the clergy are equipped with a mysterious, almost supernatural means of knowing which of their parishioners are ill, and failure to visit them leads to an amazing amount of resentment. But assuming that in some roundabout way the parson has got to know and has arrived at the bedside, what then? He is as anxious as the doctor for the patient to get better, and will do all he can to help. Usually that is quite a straight-forward affair. But it is not always so easy as that. In

cases of dangerous illness it is often very difficult for the parson to know just how to go about his work, when the right or wrong approach can make all the difference to the outcome. And when the termination is bound to be fatal, it is good for the parson to know first, because he can do more than anyone else to make the way smoother, not only for the patient, but almost as important, for the relatives as well.

Enough has been said on these lines to suggest the need for a measure of co-operation between doctors and parsons in general practice. Here it would be best to pause and summarize the argument so far. On the one hand is the doctor who begins from the physiological and pathological side in dealing with people, but whose job is complicated from time to time by psychological factors which arise either from the illness itself or from maladjustment in the wider social, moral, and what we should call the spiritual environment. On the other hand, there is the parson who is concerned primarily with the psychological side (in a non-technical sense) of life and its relationships, whose work is constantly being complicated by conditions which have a physical origin.

That, briefly, is the case for co-operation — that it is impossible to isolate our work or to prevent it overlapping in the complex state of society in which we have to live. If both doctors and clergy are willing to grant that, how are we to set about implementing it? The first essential is to break down such traces as remain of mutual suspicion and ignorance about each other. That can only be done by our getting to know one another outside our professional work. Doctors will find that, generally speaking, the clergy are very human, and that they are blessed with about as much intelligence as any other similar body of men. My own experience of doctors in the past year and a half as Chaplain to two large general hospitals has been very happy. I have found much more in common with them than perhaps I expected. The trouble with us both is that, although our work brings us more into touch with the common man than of any other of the professions, the common man thinks of us as being quite unlike other mortals. The doctor is regarded as superhuman, or at any rate gifted with more than human skill and

knowledge. The parson is commonly thought of as being non-human altogether, and by virtue of having his collar back to front, delivered from all human frailties and passions. Reacting to this, doctors, like the clergy, tend to herd together, talking endless shop; with the result that we are both in danger of regarding ourselves, like the Pharisee in the Bible, as not quite like other men, and perhaps thanking God for it. Quite apart from anything else, it would do us both a lot of good to meet on equal terms in a friendly way outside our professional work. My impression of the meetings of the doctors and parsons which have been held during 1941 in Sheffield is that the personal contacts we made with each other were just as valuable in their way as the discussions, and as far as the discussions were concerned there was a surprising amount of agreement. And there is another point which is not unimportant. In a good many areas the parson is probably the only other cultured and educated man besides the doctor. One would think that it would be for their own mutual good, not to say sanity, that they should be on friendly meeting terms.

Here it would be wise to issue a warning to doctors. When you come up against people suffering from delusions which seem to have a religious origin, do not be too hasty in arriving at the conclusion that religion is unhealthy nonsense. It will usually be found that people of this kind belong to one of two classes. Either they are those who have no sound knowledge of the Christian religion at all — because a little religious knowledge can be as dangerous as a little medical knowledge, and the Bible in some hands can have results just as disastrous as 'the Home Family Doctor' in others; or they are those who belong to one of the freak versions of Christianity, which are about as popular with us as is Osteopathy with the regular medical practitioner, and have the same relation to the real thing.

Let us assume that the doctor and the parson, having come to know one another, agree to co-operate. In the majority of cases where their work converges, there will be no need for them to meet and discuss them. The fact that the parson knows the doctor and his general approach to things will enable him to get on with his part of the job, and perhaps the doctor too will

know what he can leave to the parson. Even when a case is rather more complicated, long consultations will not be necessary. The doctor ought to say all he can on the medical aspect of the case, and he should not be afraid of asking the parson what he thinks of it from his point of view. The latter may know or have noticed something which will be quite helpful to the medical practitioner. Then a few questions and answers should clear up any outstanding difficulties, the whole thing taking no more than a few minutes. The really difficult cases will probably not be very frequent. But the time and trouble involved when doctors and parsons work in isolation might probably be halved if they could spend half an hour or so together at the beginning.

There is one other aspect of co-operative activity. Both doctors and clergy have it borne in on them sooner or later that many of the ills they are trying to remedy are directly or indirectly due to the imperfect and unsatisfactory structure of society. Very often these structural defects are not purely medical or religious, *e.g.* slums, overcrowding, malnutrition, unemployment and so on. Usually there is a public economic factor involved as well, and for that reason presumably these public defects are left to the politician to deal with. It is certain that there will be more of these social problems after the war, and we shall have to make up our minds whether the solution of them is to be left entirely in the politician's hands. After all, whether we are looking after the religious or the physical well-being of the community, we spend a good deal of our time patching up the casualties of the social and economic machine. It would therefore be not only reasonable, but highly desirable that as doctors and ministers of religion we should make a greater joint contribution than in the past to the solution of these social questions. Between us we possess an unrivalled knowledge of the great mass of the community, of their living, working, recreational, and cultural conditions and standards, which, unlike the knowledge of the politicians in many cases, is first hand and acquired as it were *in situ*. By thinking and working together now we can, if only we will, be preparing ourselves to exercise a great influence for good in the reconstruction of society which is bound to take place, in one way or another, after the war.

SCRIPTURAL AUTHORITY AND ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY

By The Editor

MUCH confusion of thought exists in Church circles to-day as to whether the authority of the Church is superior to the authority of the Bible or subordinate to it. It is best at the outset to remove the Old Testament from the sphere of discussion. The Old Testament alone constituted the Scriptures of the Primitive Christian Church. She inherited them from Judaism. This she did (according to the primitive Christian view) by virtue of her rightly understanding, fulfilling, and obeying them—which Judaism having failed to do, forfeited the spiritual right to possess them.

Whenever the Scriptures are referred to in the New Testament, as for instance in St. Paul's statements that 'Christ died for our sins *according to the Scriptures* . . .' and that 'he was raised again on the third day *according to the Scriptures* . . .' (*I Cor.* xv, 3, 4), he is referring to the Old Testament Scriptures whose oracles and predictions he believed to be fulfilled by these events. It was not until nearly a century later that portions of our New Testament came to be regarded as Scripture.

Thus the case of the New Testament is quite different from that of the Old Testament. Christian men—members of the Christian Church—wrote the New Testament. Other Christian men selected our New Testament from a wide range of primitive Christian writings and constituted them into a Canon. That is to say, they gave them a position of unique authority for members of the Christian Church who wished to know the truth about Jesus and his Gospel, the origin of the Christian Church and its apostolic teaching and institutions. Since then, the Church has not only preserved, studied, interpreted these Scriptures, but has translated them into many different languages. Article XX declares the Church to be 'a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ' (*testis et conservatrix*). Truly she has been a keeper of Holy Writ, and her conscientiousness, courage, dili-

gence in this matter are beyond praise. Her function as a witness of Holy Writ is thus defined by Bishop Gibson:

> (1) 'as testifying to us what books are to be regarded as Scripture';
> (2) 'as declaring to us what is the meaning of Scripture.'
> (Gibson, *The XXXIX Articles*, p. 526.)

Her testimony in both these spheres has been variable. For instance, she excluded, from the Canon, books which had been read as canonical, *e.g.* Clement's *Epistle to the Corinthians* (incorporated in *Codex Alexandrinus*), *The Epistle of Barnabas* and *The Shepherd of Hermas* (incorporated in *Codex Sinaiticus*). In her function of declaring the meaning of Scripture the variation has been great indeed, as any English reader can discover by perusing Dean Farrar's Bampton Lectures on *The History of Interpretation*, which, however, do not include the latest curiosities in that sphere created by British Israelites and Jehovah's witnesses.

Because the Church has played and does play such an important part with regard to the New Testament, it is very natural that some Christians should assume that the Church possesses greater authority than does the New Testament. This view the Church of England has clearly, forcibly and constantly declared to be erroneous.

(1) In Article VI it is declared that

> 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.'

The Christian Church must not demand from Christian men the acceptance of any dogmas which are non-scriptural. There has been a recurring tendency on the part of the Church to go beyond this in her legislation. As Richard Baxter wrote in the seventeenth century:

> 'The plague of the Church for above a thousand years has been the enlarging our Creed and making more fundamentals than God ever made.'

(ii) In Article VIII it is declared that

> 'The Three Creeds . . . ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture.'

The Creeds may be, or may not be, in all respects accurate summaries of theological, historical and spiritual truths taught in holy Scripture, but they possess no *absolute* authority of themselves. The authority of the Creeds is a *derived* authority, and that authority is derived from Scripture itself.

(iii) In Article XX it is declared:

> 'The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in controversies of Faith: And yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written: . . yet as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of Salvation.'

We have already noted this restrictive authority of Scripture over the legislative powers of the Church, and offer no further comment.

(iv) In Article XXI it is declared:

> 'General Councils . . . may err and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture.'

(v) In Article XXXIV it is declared:

> 'It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies [of the Church] be in all places one and utterly like; but they must not be ordained against God's Word.'

Since the doctrine of our Church is so clear as to the authority of Scripture over the authority of the Church, how is it that the view has grown up in certain circles that the Church is superior in authority to the New Testament? There are, we think, two general reasons for this.

(1) During the last three generations, owing to the influence of the Romantic movement, the Tractarian movement, and the Socialist movement, there has been in English circles a great development in the whole conception of the authority and office of the Church. This has led the clergy, particularly in their teaching and preaching, to substitute the formula 'the Church teaches' or 'the Church commands' for the older formula 'the Bible teaches' or 'the Scripture commands.' This substitution has been resented by many of the English laity, but it has changed the outlook of not a few of the English clergy, for it

often happens that the preacher is more influenced by his sermon than is his congregation.

(2) On the other hand, the authority of the Bible has steadily declined during the same period, due to a popular misapprehension and mistaken valuation of the results of scientific research and historical and literary criticism. Many people, uneducated and half-educated, have been quick to seize upon the *negative* results of modern research and higher criticism, and to apply them in such a way as to deprive Biblical teaching of any claim upon their reverence and faith. It is quite true that those researches and results have shattered the age-long belief of Christian men in the plenary verbal inspiration and absolute infallibility of Holy Scripture. The Bible can no longer be regarded in the way our grandfathers regarded it — as infallible in the spheres of physical science, anthropology, archaeology, history, and literary criticism. In these matters the Bible reflects the current conclusions of the age or ages when it was written. The *positive* results of Biblical criticism English people have been much slower in assimilating, mainly because such positive results, being constructive and not destructive, demand much more mental effort to grasp and apply. Hence the wonderful story which criticism has unveiled to us, not only of the evolution of the whole conception of the Divine Being and Character: the evolution in moral standards and ideals: the amazing way in which religion has reacted on civilization and civilization on religion: and, above all, the immense importance for personal life and for social life of belief in God, love of God, obedience to God, and that human life, bereft of these springs of being and growth, is poor indeed.

Hence it has come about that as a consequence of this double contemporary movement of increasing regard for the Church in Church circles and the decreasing regard for the Bible in the rapidly increasing non-Christian community which surrounds the Church and interpenetrates it, a situation has been created in which it becomes almost natural for a growing percentage of Christian people to set the authority of the Church above the authority of the New Testament.

These two general conclusions, however, are not used as arguments in Church circles for the superior authority of the

Church to that of the New Testament. The reasons assumed are :

(1) The Church is older than the New Testament; and

(2) The New Testament was created by the Church.

The argument which assumes that because the Church is older than the New Testament, therefore it has greater authority than the New Testament, is fallacious. It is an inheritance from our pre-evolutionary way of thinking. Antiquity does not necessarily confer authority. To-day the claims of antiquity yield to the claims of modernity because the new creations of the evolutionary process are usually more valuable than the old.

The second argument, that because the Church created the New Testament she has authority over the New Testament, leaves out of account the all-important fact that it was really the Holy Spirit who inspired members of the Christian Church to write their Scriptures. Thus the primal factor in the creation of the Scriptures was the Holy Spirit.

Hence the New Testament is older in origin and more authoritative than the Christian Church, for it is Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit 'given without measure unto him' who is the primal source of that which the New Testament enshrines and strives in various forms to record, and therefore the Church must yield obedience to it.

But it may be justly asked : Is not the Church also a creation of the same spiritual impulse and spiritual forces? Most certainly it is. The real issue is not between an inspired New Testament and a non-inspired Christian Church, but between the authority of differing degrees of inspiration manifest in New Testament and Church. Has the post-New Testament Church ever reached a degree of inspiration equal to that exhibited in the New Testament? Church history answers 'No.' The golden quality of the inspiration of the New Testament is overwhelmingly demonstrable to any student of post-New Testament Church history. Hence it is on account of *the quality of the inspiration* of the New Testament that authority is rightly claimed for the New Testament over the Christian Church.

In making this supreme claim for the authority of the New Testament we do so, not as plenary verbal inspirationists, but as modern critical students of the New Testament. All portions

of the New Testament are not equally inspired and so all have not equal authority. Those portions of the New Testament which reflect standards of knowledge and modes of thought that advancing human experience has transcended should not be regarded as having any authority for the Church to-day. It is only spiritual and moral truth, expressed in terms that are eternal and universal—the Word of God in Scripture—which possesses that supreme authority to which the Christian owes obedience. Besides the inspiration of the Holy Spirit enshrined in the New Testament, and the inspiration manifest, not so much in the institutional history of the Church, as in the personalities of its prophets and saints, there is also an inspiration of the Holy Spirit manifest in the wider circles of human history, and not least in the advancing knowledge of the truth granted to scientific and historical research—the Word of God in Nature and in History.

It is this threefold Divine inspiration given through the Bible, the Church, and through expanding human experience which, rightly understood and loyally obeyed, should become the Church's guide into all truth.

SPIRITUAL SINS AND ARCHAIC THEORIES

By the Rev. A. G. Coombs, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Penzance.

PERIODS of disruption and unsettlement are notoriously congenial to irrational beliefs as well as unethical behaviour. In such times, hardly-won gains in the sphere of religious thought have often to contest ground which seemed in rosier times to be secure against assault. It may be that those rosier times did not take into sufficient account the strength of irrational forces surviving from man's racial past; on the other hand they may well have obscured some aspect of experience which only comes to light again in the searching school of adversity.

This point is illustrated by the frequent references now being made to the existence of demonic or satanic forces at work in the

world. Some of these references suggest, even if they do not openly contemplate, a harking back to demonic beliefs which we too readily assumed had disappeared from Christian thought, beliefs however which still hold in thrall the lives of millions in non-Christian lands. But there are other references couched in similar phraseology which seem to require further examination and thought. Dr. J. H. Oldham, for instance, wrote some time ago in *The Christian News-Letter* of the emergence in Germany of a new spirituality,

> 'if one may use that term to include evil as well as good, the demonic as well as the divine.'

But before turning to this tentative suggestion of Dr. Oldham, it may be useful to call further attention to what Mr. Gamaliel Milner has described as the resurgence of the infra-natural.[1] It is well to remember how comparatively recently demonic beliefs held the field of popular imagination, and that general, though by no means unanimous, repudiation of the ideas on which sorcery, black magic and witchcraft rested is little more than two centuries old. We find suggestions of scepticism about witches as far back as Samuel Butler in *Hudibras*, and, more systematically, in a treatise published in 1563 by John Wier, a physician of Cleves. But Wier did not question the activity of demons, he only went so far as to suggest that some supposedly demonic cases were in reality due to disease; Montaigne took this mild scepticism much further. But though the year 1712 witnessed the last witch trial to be held in England and the laws against sorcery were repealed in 1736, yet demonic beliefs lingered on, and well within the last century mental illnesses were still often assigned to devil possession. If the scales have now fallen from men's eyes it may not be forgotten that for centuries human life was subjected to the miseries and cruelties deriving from demonic beliefs. From the earliest times the Church as represented by its leaders and in its Councils held unswervingly to these ideas, and the horrible history of the Inquisition shows how far both the Church and the Law could go in order to extirpate witches. However much the Reformers and their opponents differed over other matters, they were in

[1] See the September, 1941, issue of the *Modern Churchman*.

complete agreement about witchcraft. Luther advocated the burning of witches, and Cranmer directed the clergy 'to seek for any that use charms, sorcery, enchantment, witchcraft, soothsaying or any like craft invented by the devil.' James I, who wrote a treatise on demonology, suspected his throne and his life to be continually threatened by witches, and a statute against witchcraft, passed in the first year of his reign, gave an impetus to persecution which was carried yet further in the Commonwealth period. What it all meant in terms of human suffering, mental and physical, is set out very clearly in the first chapter of Lecky's *Rationalism in Europe*.

We have a category of words, such as bewitched, obsessed, possessed, epilepsy, nightmare, in which the story of demonology is distilled. If such words are used to-day with a vastly changed significance, it is because the phenomena once associated with them are now explained, not away but in a different way. What was already being suggested by men like John Wier has been substantiated and carried much further by modern scientific research. Such research has not produced any evidence that human ills, sins and crimes are due to demonic influence; on the contrary, it says with increasing emphasis and conviction that it has no need of that hypothesis. All the evidence of medicine, psychology, psychical research and the social sciences, goes to show that we must look to man, his complex personality and relationships, not to non-human evil agencies, for an explanation of his woes. And this applies as much to one devil as to many. When the Hebrew prophets had finally broken down the age-long polytheism of their nation, Hebrew thought took over, in the Persian period, a strain of dualism based on the teaching of Zoroaster. Thus it came about that while the many evil gods had been abolished, one, corresponding to the Zoroastrian Ahriman, the God of Darkness, was retained. He is the Satan of subsequent Jewish and Christian history. This conception of Satan as a personal being is the outcome of a dualism which lands the Christian thinker and the Christian moralist to-day in difficulties more satisfactorily met by the scientific study of man's nature. Where fainting, paralysis, epilepsy, insanity, have been found capable of a different and

more hopeful explanation than demonic possession, there is good reason to hope that other obscure and baffling phenomena will similarly be explained.

But to return to Dr. J. H. Oldham. We may do well to enquire whether apology is needed for bringing under the head of spirituality evil as well as good. According to our commonly accepted use of the word this is a deviation requiring some explanation, for when we refer to a spiritually-minded man or a man of deep spirituality, we are referring not to something evil but to something good. We should find it puzzling if a man of evil character was described to us as a spiritually-minded man. Yet in fact, he might well be that. And if Dr. Oldham's diagnosis is correct, it would be right to describe Hitler as a spiritually-minded man.

This is not a doctrinaire matter of words. The accepted use of 'spiritual' to denote only something good goes back, we may suppose, to the idea which thinks of sin solely in terms of sins of the flesh. From the beginning Christian thought has been distorted by some form of dualism. In the early history of the Church the study of physical phenomena was not so much neglected as despised, and this contempt of the world, which included of course contempt of the body, persisted till the Renaissance. The Manichaean heresy underlined prevailing notions about the evil inherent in the body, and helped to perpetuate the idea that all sins for which man could be held responsible were sins of the flesh. Though this idea finds no countenance whatever in the teaching and practise of Christ, though much in the teaching of Saint Augustine, it has very largely dominated the thought and disciplinary activities of the Church. And one of the clearest evidences of the conversion of the Church to the standards of the Gospel will be seen in a changed estimation of sins of the flesh as compared with sins of the spirit. This changed estimation will be both Christian and evolutionary. For while sins of the flesh indicate reversion to a stage man is outgrowing, sins of the spirit thwart the next stage forward in the creative process, namely, the flowering of the inner life.

There are then these sins which cannot be explained in terms

either of our animal nature or of a reversion to animalism. Baron von Hügel observed that sins of this kind are occasioned by what he called the delicate poise of our imperfect freedom, and here, in his connection of freedom with spirit, he seems to take us to the root of the matter. It must be something more than an odd coincidence that this connection can be seen also in the Hebrew, Greek and Latin equivalents of 'spirit'; we see it too in our antitheses 'the letter and the spirit,' 'matter and spirit.' Again, a man who is invited to attend our meeting writes to say he is unable to do so, but will be present 'in spirit.' That may indicate much more than polite interest. In all these cases there is an underlying suggestion of spontaneity inhering in spirit, it is a state or experience that rises above material restraints or enslaving conditions, it overpasses the space-time *continuum*. Spirit is the condition which makes freely initiated judgments and actions possible, and spiritual activity is the bringing of them into play. The upshot of the activity is not something that can be described in terms of motor response to stimulus, it is unpredictable. For example, what has been called the miracle of Dunkirk was a signal instance of spiritual activity; 300,000 cows would not thus have reacted to the situation. R. L. Nettleship in a letter to a friend[2] says:

> 'The truth seems to be that *all* activity or agency may truly be called spiritual, if by "agency" is understood that which gives rise to something which was not there before.'

Spirit then is the world in which we exercise the measure of freedom we possess. But *how* we exercise that freedom is not decided by our spirituality but by our sense of values; the point being that spirituality, so far as values are concerned, is neutral. Our spirituality may be a seed plot for the growth of goodness, truth and beauty; equally well there could flourish in it the opposites of these values. One spiritual man may be known by his charity, another by his bigotry. S. Paul contrasts the manifest works of the flesh with what he must have felt the less obvious fruits of the Spirit, *i.e.* Holy Spirit. He might have given the Galatians a list comprising fruits of Evil Spirit, and in fact some of his works of the flesh are not fleshly sins but spiritual.

[2] *Philosophical Remains*, p. 22.

So it would be singularly obtuse to class belief in Evil Spirits along with black magic and sorcery, and discard it as outworn and outmoded. The oft-made charge against our times of a defective sense of sin is generally connected with sins of the flesh. This is a superficial reckoning, excluding what are in the New Testament the far more malignant sins of the spirit, such as gloom, bitterness, hypocrisy, hatred. Sins of this kind especially cannot be written off merely as the absence of good, they are positive and militant. And their ramifications are incalculable, much more so than those of the sins of the flesh.

Confronting every man of every generation there is a 'world' of evil composed of the false values freely accepted and made their own by former generations. This is the world of spiritual idolatry that 'lieth in wickedness,' and which the Catechism calls upon us, not to appease, but to renounce. It cannot be a matter for surprise if this accumulated force of evil spirituality breaks out from time to time in such strength that it bursts the barriers of all material restraints. This war is no doubt helping us to recognize more clearly what is after all plain enough in the New Testament and in the higher reaches of the prophetic writings of the Old Testament, that there is such a thing as evil spirituality.

But appreciation of this fact does not require us to explain the phenomena in terms of the old and discredited devil possession. There may well be spirits other than human, and good and bad, in the unseen world; we have no grounds in fact or reason for denying this. But to make non-human evil spirits the scapegoat for the condition of the world to-day gravely obscures the collective responsibility of past and present members of human society, including of course ourselves. When evil breaks loose and shakes off all disguise there seems to be a general tendency to turn outside the realm of human origin and agency for an explanation of it. But before we resort to such an explanation, and at the best it could afford only academic satisfaction, we should do well to explore the area of the known or the knowable. And knowledge of the facts is the pre-requisite of grace to deal with them wisely.

LAODICAEA AND ITS EYESALVE

By the Rev. JOHN TODD, M.A., Rector of Waterstock, Oxford.

THE Seven Letters addressed to the Seven Churches of Asia Minor—Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, Laodicaea—by the Apocalyptic Seer, which constitute the Introduction (*Rev.* i, 4 to iii, 22) to *The Revelation of St. John the Divine*, require for their proper understanding and elucidation a precise knowledge of the allusions, religious, geographical, political and archaeological, with which they abound.

Although we owe much to Sir William Ramsay, our greatest classical archaeologist in this sphere,[1] there still remain a certain number of allusions which are in need of further elucidation. My concern here is with *The Letter to the Laodicaeans* (*Rev* iii, 14-22), remarkable among the Seven Letters for its irony.

In the Roman Empire there were eight cities which bore the name Laodicaea. The Laodicaea with which we are concerned stood about a hundred miles due east of Ephesus in the valley of the River Lycus, seven miles from where the Lycus flows into the Maeander. The city was founded by Antiochus II, the Greek king of Syria (216-246 B.C.), and named after his wife, Laodicaea. This must have been a few years before 249 B.C., for in that year Antiochus divorced Laodicaea and married Berenice, daughter of Ptolemy II, and 'a king's daughter of the south' came 'to the king of the north,' an event referred to in *Daniel* xi, 6. Laodicaea undoubtedly owed its importance and wealth to its position where main roads met, for the great trade route from Ephesus to the east passed through it, whilst the road from Attaleia on the coast of Pamphylia ran north-east through Laodicaea and on to Philadelphia and Pergamos.

A Christian Church was founded in Laodicaea together with the sister Churches of Colossae and Hierapolis, all three in the Lycus valley, in the Phrygian Highlands, during the period when St. Paul was founding his great Church in Ephesus. St. Paul himself was not directly the founder of these Churches in

[1] See *The Letter to the Seven Churches of Asia.*

the Lycus valley. They would seem to have been founded by Epaphras (*Col.* i, 7; iv, 12; *Ph'm.* 23), an inhabitant of those regions and one of St. Paul's converts. In *Collossians* iv, 16 St. Paul refers to his Epistle to the Laodicaeans, which is usually identified by scholars with the *Epistle to the Ephesians*[2] in our New Testament.

The Apocalyptic Seer's letter contains four local allusions —(i) lukewarm insipidity, (ii) gold refined by fire, (iii) white garments, (iv) eyesalve:

> 'I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So because thou art lukewarm, and neither hot nor cold, I will spew thee out of my mouth. Because thou sayest, I am rich, and have gotten riches, and have need of nothing; and knowest not thou art the wretched one and miserable and poor and blind and naked: I counsel thee to buy of me gold refined by fire, that thou mayest become rich; and white garments, that thou mayest clothe thyself, and that the shame of thy nakedness be not made manifest; and eyesalve to anoint thine eyes, that thou mayest see' (iii, 15-18).

(i) The comparison of the Church of Laodicaea to lukewarm water, which causes a feeling of sickness in him who tries to drink it, would seem to be a reference, so Dr. Swete suggested, to the water from the hot springs of Hierapolis, which in their journey across the plateau become lukewarm and in that condition discharge themselves over the cliff right opposite to Laodicaea. This water, neither hot nor cold, is characteristic of Laodicaean churchmanship.

(ii) Laodicaea was a banking centre, and so rich was the city that when it was destroyed by an earthquake in 60 A.D. the Laodicaeans proudly declared that they had no need of outside help to rebuild the city; they would rebuild it from their own resources. Well might the Laodicaeans say: 'I am rich and have gotten riches and have need of nothing.' But the writer of the letter tells the Laodicaeans that in reality they are poor: 'I counsel thee to buy of me gold refined by fire that thou mayest become rich.'

(iii) Thirdly, Laodicaea was renowned for garments made from the soft black wool of the district. 'The country around Laodicaea,' says Strabo, the great classical geographer, writing

[2] There is extant an Epistle to the Laodiceans both in Greek and in Latin, but it is an obvious forgery.

about 20 A.D., 'breeds excellent sheep remarkable not only for the softness of their wool . . . but for their dark or raven colour' (XII, c. viii, 16). The particular garment made at Laodicaea was the *trimiton*, or 'thrice woven,' and so famous did Laodicaea become for this kind of garment that the city was afterwards known as Trimitaria. But the very city so famous for the manufacture of its garments is told that it is naked and needs white garments. 'I counsel thee to buy of me . . . white garments that thou mayest clothe thyself.'

(iv) Finally, Laodicaea is advised to buy eyesalve to anoint its eyes because it is blind. Now just as the writer of the letter contrasts the gold for which Laodicaea was famous with the *refined* gold which he offers the Laodicaeans, and just as he contrasts the black garments for which Laodicaea was famous with the white garments which he offers, so there must have been an eyesalve for which Laodicaea was famous which he intends to contrast with the eyesalve which he offers them. What was the famous eyesalve of Laodicaea?

Thirteen miles west of Laodicaea stood the famous temple of Mên Karou, *i.e.* the goddess Mên worshipped by the Carians, and in connection with that temple there was a medical school in Strabo's time, *c.* 20 A.D. This medical school, an offshoot of the great medical school of Alexandria, probably arose as a result of the flight of the *savants* of Alexandria from the persecution of Ptolemy Euergetes II (145-116 B.C.), when that bloated tyrant drove the scientists and literary men from the museum. The medical school seems to have had its centre in Laodicaea itself, judging from the fact that coins of Laodicaea bear the names of the physicians Zeuxis and Alexander Philalethes. In addition to the names of Zeuxis and Alexander Philalethes a few names of Laodicaean physicians have come down to us, and amongst them that of Demosthenes Philalethes, the greatest oculist of the ancient world. The work of this great oculist of Laodicaea influenced ophthalmic study for more than a thousand years, for his work was translated into Latin by Vindicianus, proconsul of Africa and friend of St. Augustine, and this Latin version became the text-book of ophthalmic study in the Middle Ages, and no less a scholar than Gerbert, afterwards Pope

Sylvester II (999-1003), lectured on it at Chartres, the earliest medical school in the West.

That oculists abounded in the Roman Empire we know from inscriptions (one man is described as 'oculist to the British Navy') and from numerous literary references, as well as from the large number of 'oculists' stamps' that have been found. These oculists' stamps, examples of which may be seen in the British Museum, consist of rectangular slabs of steatite, or soapstone, about $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches square and about half-an-inch thick. The ointments were pounded on them and the edges of the slabs bore inscriptions, cut in intaglio, giving the name of the oculist and the name of the remedy and its purpose. For example, one of the slabs in the British Museum has this inscription:

Q. Juni Tauri anodynum ad omn(em) lippit(udinem),
(*'The anodyne of Q. Junius Taurus for every kind of soreness of the eyes'*).

Juni Tauri crocod(es) Paccian(um) ad cica(trices) et reum(a).
(*'Saffron ointment for scars and discharges prepared by Junius Taurus after the prescription of Paccius'*).

The salves appear to have been made up into sticks and then stamped with the engraved edge of the stone.

What was the eyesalve for which Laodicaea was famous when the *Book of the Revelation* was written? The Greek word that is used, κολλούριον, provides no clue, for *collyrium* denoted any drug or preparation that was used for ophthalmic trouble, and Galen mentions nearly two hundred *collyria*. Professor Ramsay says that this *collyrium* of Laodicaea was the well-known Phrygian stone, and Dr. Moffatt in his commentary on the *Book of the Revelation* says the same. True, Laodicaea was in Phrygia, and Galen does, in fact, recommend the use of Phrygian stone for eye trouble.

> 'You will strengthen the eyes,' says Galen, 'by using the dry *collyrium* of Phrygian stone, introducing the probe into the eyelids without touching the membrane of the eye within. This, indeed, women do every day when they tinge their eyes with black.'

Certain indications suggest that this Phrygian stone was copper sulphate, popularly known among us as blue vitriol, or 'blue stone,' and it is significant that Galen tells us that his friendship with the imperial procurator of the copper mines in Soli in the north of Cyprus enabled him to get a supply of copper vitriol.

But is it so certain that the writer of the letter to Laodicaea is referring to Phrygian stone? To differ from Professor Ramsay on a matter connected with the 'Seven Churches of Asia,' or from Dr. Moffatt on a point of New Testament exposition, may well seem not merely rash but idle. Nevertheless I venture to suggest that these scholars are wrong, and that the eye ointment for which Laodicaea was famous was *lycium*, an ointment which took its name from the neighbouring province of Lycia.

In the British Museum may be seen a small lead pot, subovoid in shape, 1⅛ inches high and three-quarters of an inch wide, and on it is engraved a tiny tripod of Apollo, the god of healing, and the words: ΛΥΚΙΟΝ ΠΑΡΑ ΜΟΥΣΑΙΟΥ. ('*The lycium sold by Musaeus*'). At least three more pots for eyesalve have been found, and one of them is labelled 'The *lycium* of Heracleides.' Heracleides was the great physician of Tarentum, and Galen valued his eyesalve so much that he preserved the prescription. Indeed, ancient physicians like Galen, Oribasius and Paul of Aegina constantly praise the virtues of *lycium*, and Dioscorides, a medical officer in the army of Nero, recommends it for obscurities of the cornea and for puritus of the eyelids. The *lycium* was obtained chiefly in Cappadocia and Lycia, but an even better variety was procured from India. Scribonius Largus, who was physician to the Emperor Claudius and accompanied him to Britain, says that he 'attributes to no *collyrium* whatever such great efficacy as to the genuine Indian *lycium* used by itself.' *Lycium*, prepared from the root of berberis and compounded with burnt alum and opium, is still in common use in India to-day as an eyesalve, and was used in the Edinburgh Eye Dispensary in the nineteenth century. And so, though patients no longer seek the tepid waters of Laodicaea, though the gold of Laodicaea has disappeared, though the garments of Laodicaea are forgotten, the eyesalve of Laodicaea persists to our own day.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CHURCH IN THE NEW ORDER

It would be unfortunate if the term 'the New Order' were to be appropriated, without challenge, by the Nazis, since

> 'there is no doubt that a new world order has come; the present conflict is to decide whether men are to be free in it.'

So there is reason why those who value human freedom should not attempt to think out schemes of a New Order; and that such thinking need not be postponed until victory has been won is proved by the promulgation of the Atlantic Declaration, which no one thought premature.

As the New Order has developed in totalitarian states it has involved a wide extension of state control in every sphere of human life, not only in the political and economic, but in the cultural sphere also, *i.e.* in art, education, religion, science. Inasmuch as the cultural sphere is the creative one, it is plain that its immobilization by state control is fatal to human progress. But what is not so often recognized is that this fatal extension of state power appears to have been the logical result of the 'liberal' ideology which believed that the State's responsibility for the individual should be made as complete as possible. As a German critic of the Nazi régime, Rauschning, has put it:

> 'The true forces of reaction are not to be found in the cliques of a governing class. Far more reactionary are the doctrinaires who, in the name of economic security for the masses, have promoted the idea of rational planning which has come from the world of technology, where it belongs, to intrude on social and political life.'

But possibly the doctrinaire idealists have been less responsible than the processes of history; the development of science and technology made large-scale 'planning' inevitable, and where there is large-scale planning the State is sooner or later bound to take a hand, because the State is the only power that can carry that sort of thing to its logical conclusion, *i.e.* to the point when there is only one control for everything; and it would seem that to go back on this kind of development would be to repudiate industrial civilization itself.

But does the rationalization of industry and the efficient organization of the life of the community necessarily involve totalitarianism and state tyranny? Is the only alternative course a return to *laisser faire*, which it is generally agreed would now result in chaos? Is there no *tertium quid* which will unite rational control and essential liberty?

An attempt to outline such a New Order for Britain has recently been made by Mr. C. B. Purdom in a book, *The New Order*.* Mr. Purdom's

* *The New Order*, by C. B. Purdom. (Dent. 1941. Price 7/6.)

reconstruction of the nation's life would be based on the functional principle. The conversion of the British State into a functional organ would involve the separation of economic and cultural from civic and political objects. Upon an economic organ would devolve those functions of the State now concerned with industry and trade, and upon a cultural organ those functions now concerned with religion, education, health, art, and science. The point about this governmental system would be that the State would be concerned strictly with its ancient functions of legislation, justice and order, while the economic and cultural spheres would be autonomous.

Mr. Purdom offers detailed proposals for the conversion of British institutions into a functional social order. In the New Britain, Parliament would consist of three functional chambers, of which the Civic Chamber would continue the specific characteristics of the House of Commons, possessing power and jurisdiction for the making of laws and retaining its age-long rules and forms as well as its ancient name. The House of Lords would be transformed into the Senate, which would consist of members appointed for life by the king from among men and women who have distinguished themselves in religion, science, art, letters, education, medicine, economics and civic affairs. Cabinet ministers would also be senators by virtue of their office; thus government policy would come before the Senate fully and at first hand.

In addition to the above there would be an Economic Chamber, to be responsible for the organization of the economic life of the community, for the creation of wealth and the supply and distribution of the goods and services required. It would be concerned with all industries, primary and secondary, with power, transport, post office, agriculture, fisheries, shipping, distribution and banking. The members of the Economic Chamber would be representative of the economic guilds which would replace, under the new system, the individualistic, competitive, and monopolistic units now controlling every industry and service. These guilds would be composed of all who are engaged in the industry or service in a managerial, administrative, technical, supervisory or operative capacity without exception, and would be chartered bodies, self-governing and directly responsible for their own affairs. Thus the Economic Chamber will be the deliberative council of the economic life of the community, and every question having bearing upon economic affairs will come before it for consideration. Thus the most complete organization of the economic resources, man-power and technical skill of the nation will be possible, and without recourse to State tyranny.

The third Parliamentary institution of the New Order will be a Cultural Chamber, which will be responsible for the cultivation of the bodily, mental and spiritual nature of the community. This Chamber will be composed of representatives of churches and the various cultural guilds set up

by charter under the legislative authority of the House of Commons and concerned with scientific, artistic, medical, educational and recreational affairs. As in the other two Chambers, the Cultural Chamber will act through various councils of its own members consisting of representatives in the Chamber of the guilds and associations forming a particular group. There will be councils for religion, for science, for art, for education, and so on, which will be of the nature of permanent parliamentary committees. The setting up of a Cultural Chamber of the kind indicated would be in effect to create (to use the expression of Sir Patrick Geddes),

> 'a spiritual power independent of the temporal power, educating and counselling it.'

Mr. Purdom holds that the chief cultural factor is religion, religion being the guarantee of freedom. Hence the place of leadership in the Cultural Chamber rightly belongs to religion. This in his view implies the unity of the churches, for while they manifest the spirit of disunity they can hardly guide the nation. A common platform for the Christian churches is therefore urgent, and progress in this direction needs to be hastened. In his view a step forward was taken when a statement was issued a year ago under the signatures of the two Anglican Archbishops, the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council, and the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster, announcing their agreement on the five peace points of Pope Pius XII as 'the foundation of national policy and of all social life.' The reconciliation of the churches is regarded by Mr. Purdom as the essential first step in the reconciliation of the nation which prepares the way for the New Order. What is required is not organic union or dogmatic agreement, but the joining of hands. Without this demonstrated and positive unity the leaders of the churches will lack the authority which they need for leadership, and the responsibility upon them in their sphere is as great as upon politicians and industrial leaders in theirs.

> 'What is required,' says Mr. Purdom, 'is not declarations upon political or social issues, but the simple achievement of Christian unity.'

He realizes that the moral demands made on the citizen by the type of social reconstruction he envisages are so great that only by the aid of the strongest ethical principles and through the most unshakeable religious conviction will the response be adequate.

> 'Should the churches fall, which God forbid, the leadership of the nation will pass to the men of science, for cultural leadership there must be, and if the churches cannot supply it the nation will find it elsewhere.'

This primacy of place for religion in the New Order has nothing in common with those schemes of a semi-theocratic nature which would endow the Church with comprehensive powers of control over the citizen, for what power the Church possessed would be due solely to its spiritual and moral

influence. The Church is spiritually concerned with the whole of human life, and its influence should be felt everywhere.

> 'No greater confusion can befall a nation than when the churches interfere in education, or science, or art, which are closely related to them but different in their ends and functionally distinguishable. The Church is the guardian of the principle of personality, of human responsibility, of the sacredness of the human family, and of the end of man in God. It exists to announce the kingdom of God and the good news of the Gospel, but it is not another form of totalitarianism, and to say that it is God's creation is not to say that it is absolute. The churches' function is so to guide men that in every association Christian principles are observed; but they possess no function to enforce action, which is the responsibility of individual consciences. The practice of the Catholic Church is not without ambiguity on this point, and the Protestant Churches constantly trespass; but in the cultural realm of the New Order there ought to be no ambiguity nor trespass.'

The above passage is of particular interest in connection with education. The Church has been too anxious to establish control over schools, colleges and universities, and it has been claimed that this is the only alternative to the control of all educational institutions by the State, the evils of which are conspicuous in Germany and elsewhere. But if we do not want Dr. Goebbels, neither do we particularly care for the Jesuits. As a matter of fact, a church possessing genuine spiritual influence would have no more need to seek to control education than the Royal Society or the British Association. In Mr. Purdom's New Order leaders of education would be elected by an educational guild to sit in the Cultural Chamber, and matters of education would be dealt with by the Council for Education within that Chamber. Also, distinguished educationists would be members, along with distinguished men of science and leaders of religion, in the Senate. This is far better than either control by the priest or control by the politician. Education can perfectly well control itself, and would be all the better for so doing, and if both Church schools and State schools were things of the past. The child would then play without hurt round the basilisk's den, without fear of either priest or propagandist trying to proselytize it.

> 'Education in the New Order will not be controlled by the State, but will be entirely subject to the Cultural Chamber. The evils of State education are to be seen everywhere, the young sacrificed to political ends in every country. Though in totalitarian countries the sacrifice is most complete and shameless, every state inculcates ideas favourable to itself, teaches history of its own making, and presses the mind of the child into its mould. Nowhere does education exist for the sake of the child; everywhere education is used as an instrument of class or other interests valuable to the State. This will not happen in New Britain.'

With regard to the Council for Religion within the Cultural Chamber, its function will not be to control religion or the churches, but to represent

religious unity and pursue common objects; it will have nothing to do with doctrine or belief in the internal working of any church. Through the Council the churches will be brought into association with the cultural guilds and cultural activities generally of the nation, and this will be of mutual benefit. The object of the Council for Religion will be to express religious unity, so that those representing the separate religious organizations that form it will act in the Council to fulfil that object.

> 'The function of the members of the Council will be, not to represent their own churches and religions, maintaining distinctive and opposed points of view or fundamental beliefs, but to represent those aspects of their associations in which they are in unity with others, and to devote this unity to the national good.'

There can be little doubt that it would be a considerable advantage to the leaders of all churches to sit in a Cultural Chamber and to take their part in a Council of Religion, and the advantage would be shared by the churches to which they belong. In a Chamber of the kind described, church leaders would be brought into close contact with scientists, scholars, educationists, writers, philosophers — a contact involving close co-operation. Not only would religion itself benefit, but all cultural activities would benefit also. Religion at any rate would at last get a chance of becoming something more than the sectional interest that it is at present. Church leaders would soon lose their present somewhat narrow institutional outlook in this new collaboration. The essence of a functional system is that an association, religious or other, does not exist for its own sake but for some end greater than itself.

Mr. Purdom gives reasons for believing that the establishment of his Economic Chamber would provide new motives for economic activity and give new vitality to industry and commerce. There are no less strong grounds for holding that his Cultural Chamber would stimulate the intellectual and cultural life of the community; and the participation of religious leaders in the work of the Chamber and in the Council of Religion could not but strengthen and enrich the life of religion. New Britain would not only be more healthy economically and politically, but more vigorous intellectually and spiritually. Mr. Purdom's proposals deserve careful examination by all who believe that the times are ripe for some kind of a New Order — a New Order where men can be truly free. J. C. HARDWICK.

TEXT AND COMMENTARY

The number of books written about the Bible is surely beyond computation. No man, though he were to read continuously from sunrise to sunset, could hope in the course of a single lifetime to acquaint himself with more than a small fraction of this vast body of accumulated commentary. On the other hand, there is surely no man so busy as to be unable to find some short space every day in which to ponder on some little bit of wise counsel from

his own Bible. And books such as *Let the Bible help You*[1] are wholly admirable, in that they at least keep alive, and indeed in some instances stimulate anew, an interest in the sacred text in a world now sadly and self-sufficiently secular in its literary leanings. This is a well-planned book of quotations, arranged under headings as to 'needs' (for 'Students,' 'Business People,' etc.) and subjects ('Prayer,' 'Courage,' 'Peace,' etc.). There are in all 1,500 such quotations, chapter and verse, from the Authorised Version. It is well printed, inexpensive and of handy pocket-size. Left in the guest-room, the canteen or the school library, it cannot but do its own good work—the Bible is like that. And it is a book for the busy parson. It will save him much searching in his Cruden for the ideal text. The volume deserves to be very successful, for the editor has chosen his verses wisely and well.

Another little book to leave 'lying about' in some well-frequented room is Dr. Karney's series of sermons — seven in number — preached at Winchester and now collected into a small volume published by Mowbray & Co.[2] They are a re-examination of the Doctrine of God as set forth in the Bible, and are simple, clear and forward-looking. The Bishop of Southampton is one of that little band of preachers (his brother of Lichfield is another) whose pulpit utterances in these days combine outspokenness and criticism of our corporate failings with moderation and a fine Christian optimism. Why don't the Penguin people scatter books of intelligent sermons round our station bookstalls?

The above books, then, may be safely left to do their own good work. Would that all 'Bible books' were as acceptable to every kind of reader. But they are not, and it is always these books *about* the Bible which cause such debate and argument. I have before me now two more volumes of 'criticism,' and once again it is the book *Genesis* which comes under the author's microscope. For the first,[3] one can have nothing but praise. Mr. Cullen Young, a missionary who has lived for many years among one of the child races of Central Africa, has really succeeded in bringing fresh light to bear upon the strange folk-tales of *Genesis*. Here we have the idea of 'progressive revelation' explained and illustrated by comparison with the anxious questionings of primitive people of our own day. Many of the things which enquiring young folks in school and Bible-class are puzzled to understand (doublets, inconsistencies, the longevity of the patriarchs, etc.) are here explained, and never 'explained away.' The book is worth studying as an introduction to the more intelligent reading of Scripture. The spirit of the author is best illustrated by this quotation from his concluding remarks:

> 'Even in the time of our parents the Bible was read, Sunday-school classes taught, and sermons preached, in ignorance of very much that

[1] *Let the Bible help You*, edited by George Perry Dixon. Allen & Unwin. pp. 191. 1941. 3/6.

[2] *God in the Bible*, by the Rt. Rev. A. Karney, D.D., Bishop of Southampton. Mowbray & Co. pp. 76. 1941. 1/6.

[3] *The Genesis Mosaic*, by Cullen Young. Religious Education Press. pp. 88. 1941. 1/6.

is, or ought to be, common knowledge among us to-day. Much, of course, depends upon our own open-mindedness to the use of modern knowledge as applied to the Bible, and our own faith in God's promise to lead us by His Spirit "into all truth."'

By way of contrast, let us now turn to a personal reminiscence of the author of the second[4] of these two 'critical' books, for this anecdote, or so it seems to me, is an adequate commentary upon what we are likely to meet with in the text:

'Some years ago' (writes Wing-Commander Wiseman), 'a young chaplain called on me; we were complete strangers, but seeing on a shelf in my room a book entitled *Daniel the Prophet,* he remarked, "You don't believe that kind of thing, do you, that Daniel was a prophet? I had all that knocked out of me during the years I was at my theological college." "But," I said, "our Lord spoke of Daniel as a *prophet.*" My visitor replied, "He did not know any more about that than He could learn from the people around Him. Professor ——— says that Daniel never wrote it, that it is not prophecy, but history; it was written after the events and made to look like prophecy." I asked him whether he preferred to believe the Lord Jesus Christ or Professor ——— (I omit his name, for he is still living, and I think would be pained that anyone should take him so literally and logically); he replied, "I would rather believe Professor ———, for, living in a more modern and critical age, obviously he is more accurately informed about these things." In this way criticism has to rid itself of the testimony of the "Faithful and True Witness" in order to support its theories. It cannot be difficult for the Christian and logical mind to decide between the critics and Christ.'

I am sorry for that tactless young chaplain, and I'm sure his superior officer was too, although for a different reason! But I think our gallant author (I mean that adjective very sincerely) was very nearly guilty of spiritual blackmail.

Wing-Commander Wiseman's book has run into its third edition. It purports to prove that Moses compiled the book *Genesis.* Will anybody now say that the work of the Modern Churchmen's Union has finished? There is no question about the author's sincerity and industry. He has studied the case for the other side, but there is little doubt that when he embarked upon this task of research, his conclusions were already prescribed. As he himself writes in the wisest sentence of an otherwise oddly perverse book:

'it is the obvious bias of certain critics which deprives them of the right to be judges.'

R. B. PARKER.

A BISHOP'S IDEAL*

*A Life worth Living,** by the Bishop of Lichfield, contains a number of broadcast and other sermons delivered over a period of about two years; the first four form a series of broadcast addresses the fourth of which was

[4] *New Discoveries in Babylonia about Genesis,* by Wing-Commander P. J. Wiseman, R.A.F. Marshall, Morgan & Scott. pp. 150, 3rd edition. 1942. 4/-.

* *A Life Worth Living,* by the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Lichfield. (Student Christian Movement Press. 3/6. pp. 154.)

written but not delivered, as was that intended for the opening service of the Three Choirs Festival at Hereford in September, 1939. There are addresses given in the Potteries and before the University of Cambridge, the latter being the last in the book as well as the most recent.

Many there are who would wish to see the Church take a more active lead in the reconstruction of the post-war world, and in this book they will find much of value — practical value not divorced from the conditions of everyday life, but accepting these and pointing the way to a lasting fellowship of men. It is not, however, a recall of a wicked world to a perfect Church, but rather a source of inspiration to a Church which the writer realises can do and has done much, but yet has much to do.

For those who are seeking the answer to the inevitable question, 'Why does God bring this terror upon the earth?' much comfort and help will be found.

The essential difference between the spoken and written word is unfortunately rather apparent, and, reading the book through — although it is, perhaps, not intended for this — one feels that the context of each talk would have been clearer had a chronological order been adopted. In times of such rapidly changing circumstances the general background of conditions at the time of delivery is desirable, if not essential, to a realization of the full value of the words and references.

A valuable book full of sound, practical sense which should appeal to and help the many who are anxious for the times to come. D.L.V.

HAS BRITAIN A FUTURE?*

These six chapters, originally delivered as addresses at a Congregational Church, interpret world events from the standpoint of one who believes humanity to be in need of divine assistance if it is to make anything of its destiny. In the light of this interpretation advice for the future is given.

According to this view the present war is a symptom of 'the spiritual sickness of the whole world,' it is 'the coming out into the open of the destructive urge of society itself.'

> 'The significance of these wars of aggression is that mankind is spiritually bankrupt and is trying to blow out its brains. And the reason for this bankruptcy is perfectly clear. Men everywhere have lost their understanding of what their true nature is and what the things by which alone they can live are.'

Mr. Jenkins' view is that it has been a delusion to imagine that 'it was men's natural goodness which bound them together in one family living at peace with each other.' In reality it was 'because we found ourselves anew as God's children in Jesus Christ that we learnt to treat one another as brethren.' But now 'the Sovereign Fatherhood of God' having become

* *Britain and the Future.* By Daniel T. Jenkins. S.C.M. 2/-. 1941.

a meaningless formula, we find that the natural goodness of man is evaporating, while the purpose of true living has been lost. Thus Hitler is 'God's judgment upon us,' because he is 'the product of the rebellion against God and His order for the world in which we have all in greater or less degree taken part.'

Mr. Jenkins deplores the decline of Church authority, and attributes it to the fact that 'she has put herself on the same level as all other organizations which compete for men's allegiance.' His quarrel with the Church is that 'she had paid far too much deference to the average man's opinions, as though they made one scrap of difference to the authority of God's truth or the meaning of His purpose for the world.' Mr. Jenkins holds, however, that 'a tremendous Christian revival' is already on the way, though as yet it may only have affected 'a small number of theologians and artists and scholars.' There is an admirable chapter on 'The Foundations of Democracy,' the chief of which foundations is declared to be personal responsibility. Yet this is far from being regarded by Mr. Jenkins as innate in human beings:

> 'The sense of responsibility for managing their own lives, and concern for the well-being of the weak and defenceless which are characteristic of our western democracy at its best, are not impulses natural to men in themselves. They are the fruit of the Spirit of Jesus Christ, who came to show us what true manhood is and how to attain it.'

Of course the truth is that a number of more or less incompatible instincts are innate in human beings; the instinct to be mutually helpful is as innate as the instinct to be aggressive and egoistic. It is perhaps a mistake to assure men that all their anti-social instincts are 'innate' while their social instincts are implanted by the tutelage of the Church. Mr. Jenkins' book, in so many ways admirable for its sincerity and insight, is possibly a trifle too much inspired by the 'crisis theology' which is at present, and naturally, very popular in Protestant no less than, and perhaps more than, in Catholic circles. It may be true that, as a cynic has said, the doctrine of Original Sin is the sole Christian dogma for which there is contemporary evidence; yet this truth should be handled with extreme caution; indeed that is perhaps the case with all ecclesiastical doctrines.

It is a serious temptation for clergy and ministers to exploit our present misfortunes, by attributing them to our defection from a particular theological position. But our unhappy situation may be not altogether inexplicable on rational grounds. Sir S. Radhakrishnan has expressed it all fairly satisfactorily without having recourse to theological conceptions:

> 'The collapse of a civilization built on the audacities of speculative doubt, moral impressionism, and the fierce and confused enthusiasms of races and nations, need not dishearten us, for it has in it elements of an anti-social and anti-moral character, which deserve to perish. It is directed to the good, not of mankind as a whole, but of a powerful

privileged few among individuals as well as nations. Whatever is valuable in it will enter into the new world which is struggling to be born.'[1]

Yet Mr. Jenkins' addresses make very stimulating and provocative reading, and we heartily recommend them to clergy and laity as highly relevant to our present situation. J.C.H.

CHURCH HISTORY REPEATED*

Professor Foster is working on a very interesting line of research in his study of the analogies between the history of the early Church and the life of the young churches of Africa and the East to-day. He is himself a student and a teacher of Church History at the Selly Oak Colleges, where he is Professor of Church History. He had first-hand experience of the Church overseas on the staff of the Canton Union Theological College, and as a delegate to the Tambaram Conference. As a result of this double background, he works out in this book the theme that

> 'the Younger Churches are the Early Church of our day'; and he comments, 'I cannot teach the first four centuries as dead — because as a missionary I have been there.'

In this book he traces the analogies at such places as the mass movement of outcastes into the church and 'the persons of the most uneducated and rustic character' of whom Celsus speaks in the early Church; the growth of the World Church to-day amid invading armies and bombed cities, and the vision of the City of God from the midst of the fall of Rome; and the problems raised by Emperor worship in Japan to-day, and in the early centuries. Those who work on the history of the Church will find a new light on their studies, as they see the same issues in the living Church to-day. Those who are interested, as all Christians should be, in the growth of the younger churches will find a new insight into their problems, as they see that precisely the same problems have been faced by the Church in its earlier history.

The ease with which Professor Foster moves from century to century may sometimes make his book a little difficult for those who are unfamiliar with the events to which he refers. They will, however, find any such difficulty relieved by the wealth of illuminating anecdote with which the themes are illustrated. The book provides an important and original contribution to the training of Christian leadership in all countries. We should all agree with the verdict that Education for World Churchmanship 'should become the standard against which all theological education is judged.'

'This book begins and ends with a plea for churchmanship'; and this

[1] *Eastern Religions and Western Thought* (O.U.P., 1940), p. 33.

* *Then and Now*, by John Foster. (Student Christian Movement Press. Price 6/-, or 2/- for members of the S.C.M. Religious Book Club.)

theme runs through all its pages. The churchmanship for which Professor Foster rightly pleads is a fellowship, which would include all our divided denominations. He makes the good comment,

> 'Diversity is often due to the blessing of God; division is always due to man's mishandling of it.'

Of his experience in the East he writes: 'In China there are 132 missionary societies, which seems a sufficient advertisement of our shame.' The story which he tells as a Methodist should sum up the approach of every church, as we look toward reunion. A visitor asked him in China,

> 'Has your experience made you feel that our Church has something to contribute which China cannot afford to miss?' And he gives his answer, 'Without hesitation I replied, "Yes. . . . There is only one thing of which I am not sure: ours alone would be a partial emphasis and an insufficient contribution."'

At the same time he pleads for a churchmanship which would give proper recognition to the place of the younger churches in the one family of the World Church. There are some good and necessary criticisms of the tendency in the West for 'Foreign Missions to rank in popular esteem among the minor charities.'

We hope this book will be very widely read, in order that we may realise how the historic growth of the Church is being continued in our day in the development of the younger churches overseas. It is as true of us to-day, as it was for St. Augustine, that more important than the collapse of cities before a foreign invader is the growth of the City of God, wherein all nations and races may one day find justice and co-operation and peace.

G. F. ALLEN.

SEX IN WAR-TIME*

With this 9th edition of it, Mr. Weatherhead's well-known book, *The Mastery of Sex through Psychology and Religion,* has run into 48,000 copies. It deserves the continued demand for it, and nothing further needs to be recorded than that it is now available, in a paper cover, at the price of 3*s.* 6*d.*

Dr. Russell's book is published in a paper cover only, and a leaflet embodying the substance of Chapter 1, on 'Sex Relations without Marriage,' is even to be had for 1*d.* The book contains, of course, nothing new, but it is just the kind of book that young men and women in H.M. Forces need to read. Chaplains should certainly equip themselves with the leaflet of Chapter 1. The other chapters are on Prophylaxis against Venereal Disease, Homosexuality, Masturbation, and Continence and Health. The information given is given sensibly and coolly, in a way that should create confidence and banish fear while serving the purposes of moral education.

R. D. RICHARDSON.

* *Sex Problems in War-Time.* By G. L. Russell. (S.C.M. Press, 1941. 1/-.)
The Mastery of Sex. By Leslie D. Weatherhead. (S.C.M. Press, 1941. 5/- and 3/6.

THE LORD'S PRAYER IN A JAPANESE SETTING

*Everybody's Prayer,** by Mr. Murray Walton, is a translation and revision of a series of articles on our Lord's prayer which the author contributed to the Japanese magazine *Shinsei*. After a short consideration of the origin of the prayer in the form we use so often, there is an essay on each clause of the prayer.

Mr. Walton has not attempted any exhaustive examination of the interpretations of these clauses, but he gives us the benefit of an understanding moulded by experience and illustrates his points with many fine stories from that experience. The Japanese setting of these stories reminds us that the sons of that Eastern Empire do not all conform to the type of caricature we may be in danger of accepting as normal of the race. Kagawa is a Japanese just as Niemöller is a German.

The purpose of the book is to bring freshness to our repetition of the *Paternoster*; in this purpose the author has succeeded for us all by the variety and wealth of illustration he uses, and young people's organizations in particular should find here a helpful basis for thought, discussion, and the practice of prayer. E.D.T.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

AN OPEN LETTER TO PROFESSOR JOAD

SIR,

I should like to raise one of the points which you made in the course of an address recently on behalf of the Ministry of Information. Your argument, briefly stated, was: That we have, on the one hand, a technique, rapidly acquired, for manipulating natural and mechanical forces, and on the other, a moral and spiritual poverty which inhibits effective control of that technique for moral and spiritual ends; that the gap between them must be bridged if civilization as we know it is not only to survive but develop; and that unless we have an adequate scheme of values which has all the driving-force of religious idealism, the gap is not likely to be closed.

You then went on to ask whether the Churches could supply that scale of values, and without answering the question added that the Churches are being presented with an opportunity such as they have not had for generations. You might well have gone on to say that unless the Churches have the courage and intelligence to grasp the opportunity, they will sink into a twilight from which they will not emerge for many generations to come.

I will not press the inference that unless the Churches survive civilization will perish, because conceivably a non-Christian philosophy might supply our need, though I think you will agree that Western civilization owes as much to Christianity as to anything else, and that it is the Christian element which has held it together for so long. The point I wish to make is this. The Christian Churches could, if they were so minded, save the situation. But first they will have to frame their message in such a way that the great mass of the people, and especially the minority capable of intelligent thought, will be convinced of its truth and its applicability without any appeal to external authority. This can only be done by returning

* *Everybody's Prayer*, by W. H. Murray Walton, M.A. (Lutterworth Press. pp. 127. 1941. 2/6.)

to the principles of the Founder of the Christian religion, and then interpreting those principles in accordance with the knowledge and spiritual needs of the age — that is, by adding rational to moral and spiritual. In turn this will involve the ruthless cutting away of much dead wood in the form of doctrines which are incompatible with forthcoming knowledge (as you yourself have said in one of your books), or which are accretions and unchristian in any case. There must also be a readiness on the part of the Churches to extend their membership to all those in sympathy with their ideals, without insisting on strict credal tests.

That, Sir, is the interpretation of Christianity which a minority of us are preaching and teaching, and the outlook and temper which we are endeavouring to foster. But it looks as though the inertia of vested ecclesiastical interests, not to say of obscurantism and ignorance, is too strong to make such a change of outlook possible within the Church, at any rate before it is too late, unless we can count on those who are willing to support organized Christianity on these terms joining us in our efforts to leaven the lump. Nor is it likely that the hints and suggestions thrown out by people like yourself, who stand outside the Churches, will be any more successful than the efforts of the minority within.

Is it then an altogether vain hope that organized Christianity may yet be able to save the situation? Not necessarily. There is another possibility. The struggling minority of liberal and forward-looking Christians inside the Churches might well become a very *effective* minority, perhaps even an actual majority, if only the intelligent but ecclesiastically non-attached men and women of goodwill were to come inside *now* and add their voices to ours. Indeed, if they had done so twenty years ago the outlook might have been much less gloomy than it is to-day.

Come over into Macedonia!

A. W. ADAMS.

Royal Hospital and Infirmary, Sheffield.

A 'C.F.' ON OUR CHURCH SERVICES

SIR,

As the Chaplain concerned in the liturgical experiments to which you were so kind as to give some publicity in the January number of the *Modern Churchman*, I feel in view of the comments which you and Mr. Royds have made on the use of the Decalogue, that one important factor has been overlooked.

If I were to omit some lines out of the Commandments the men would lose the place — I have tried it and know from experience that this is so. They get bewildered and lose interest. They even get lost if a shortened form of Absolution is used in place of the fine but somewhat prolix prayer after the General Confession.

A statesmanlike view of these matters would realize the desperate urgency for a revised Prayer Book, and would daily deplore the magnificent opportunity missed in 1928. It would also consider very carefully the advantages of uniformity, so that every soldier and civilian entering a Church of England church could know exactly what he could expect and where to find it.

I plead guilty to innovation only in so far as I encourage the men to say together the prayers as written in the Book of Common Prayer, or more usually the Army Prayer Book, whose brevity and good order (at least in the liturgical portions) has much to commend it.

'C.F.'

A REVISED BAPTISMAL SERVICE

SIR,

I want to thank you for the Baptismal Service in the October issue of the *Modern Churchman*—and 'on this wise.'

X. and his wife have drifted away from Church membership. I doubt very much whether he would have had his child baptized, and our Anglican service is such a farce that I could not have urged him to do so. But when I showed him yours, they both consented enthusiastically. I wish you could have heard the expressions of satisfaction and delight at having a serivce in which all could join *ex animo*. I can assure you that it was a joy to myself to take part in such a service.

There is little doubt in my own mind that eventually X. and his wife, who both have real religion at heart (she a Presbyterian), will settle down somewhere led by 'a little child.'

A CANADIAN CANON.

ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITARIANISM

SIR,

If we go back to the spirit which Jesus showed in the Gospels we can perhaps see a way out of the present *impasse* over reunion. Let us try it. Jesus possessed a spirit of toleration which was not natural to the disciples, *e.g. Lk.* ix, 49 and *Mk.* ix, 38, 39. 'And John answered and said, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and we forbade him, because he followeth not with us. But Jesus said unto him, Forbid him not: for he that is not against you is for you.' It was the incipient spirit of authoritarianism which Jesus was rebuking; the deadliest heresy of all times, not least so when it robes itself in the vestments of the lordliest orthodoxy.

Jesus had to deal with that spirit on more than one occasion, and he definitely discouraged emphasis on greatness and authority, *e.g. Mk.* ix, 33-35. 'And they came to Capernaum: and when he was in the house he asked them, What were ye reasoning in the way? But they held their peace: for they had disputed one with another in the way, who was the greatest. And he sat down, and called the twelve; and he saith unto them, If any man would be first he shall be last of all, and minister of all.'

In *Matt.* xviii, 1-4, when the disciples asked Jesus 'Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?' he called a little child and set him in the midst of them, and said, 'Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven.'

It seems a legitimate inference that the spirit of authoritarianism was a persistent temptation of the apostles; as it has been of the Church, with unbroken continuity, ever since the apostles.

One of the last great lessons of Jesus to the disciples in St. John's Gospel (*Jn.* xiii, 1-17) was the need for service and humility. When he washed their feet he said, 'Ye call me Master, and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, the Lord and the Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example.' Jesus was anti-authoritarian: he knew what was in man.

Welney Rectory, Wisbech. A. B. JOHNSTON.